

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 76-86 are currently pending. Claims 76 and 80-82 having been amended by the present amendment, and Claims 83-86 having been added for consideration. The changes and additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification, for example, on page 116, line 9 to page 11, line 4; page 133, line 10 to page 135, line 10; and Figures 22 and 24. Thus, no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 76-82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph; Claims 76-79 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 76 and 79-82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,289) in view of Delaney (U.S. Patent No. 6,831,754); and Claims 77 and 78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwata and Delaney in view of Butterworth et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0133656, hereinafter “Butterworth”).

With respect to the rejections of Claims 76-82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, Applicant respectfully submits that the present amendments to the claims, to recite “to print, onto a printable surface of a recording medium,” overcome these grounds of rejection.

With respect to the rejections of Claims 76-79 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, Applicant respectfully submits that the present amendments to the claims overcome these grounds of rejection.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 76 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection, as independent Claim 76 recites novel features

not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references. Amended Claim 76 recites, *inter alia*:

a list reception unit configured to transmit a first transmission request for a list of the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus and to receive the list of the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus,

an operation unit configured to select a desired image data or document from the list of the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus,

a request transmission unit configured to transmit a second transmission request for sending the desired image data or document to the other image forming apparatus.

Applicant submits that Iwata fails to disclose or suggest at least these features of Claim 76.

Iwata describes a system which includes a server E103, a computer E102, and a printer E101 which transfers a document information request to the server E103 and in response, the server E103 transmits back document information to the server E103. (See Iwata, column 5, lines 28-55).

The Office Action appears to assert that the printer E101 and the server E103 of Iwata respectively correspond to the “image forming apparatus” and the “other image forming apparatus,” as defined in previously presented Claim 76. (See Office Action, page 6). Iwata describes the printer E101 receiving a document request X200 from the computer E102, transmitting the document request X200 from the computer E102 to the server E103, receiving document information X201 from the server E103 in response to the server E103 receiving the document request X200, and transmitting the document information X201 to the computer E102. (See Iwata, column 5, lines 28-55). In addition, Iwata describes that the printer E101 may receive a print request X202 from the computer E102, and acquire and print the relevant document X203. (See Iwata, column 5, lines 56-65).

However, Iwata merely describes that the printer E101 forwards a document request X200 received from the computer E102 to the server E103, forwards the document information X201 received from the server E103 to the computer E102, receives the print request X202 from the computer E102, acquires the document from the server E103, and prints the document X203.

Iwata does not describe the printer E102 (i.e., as the asserted image forming apparatus) transmitting a first transmission request for a list of the documents (i.e., as the first image data or the first document) stored in the server E103 (i.e., as the asserted other image forming apparatus), ***receiving the list of the documents*** (i.e., as the first image data or the first document) ***stored in the server E103*** (i.e., as the asserted other image forming apparatus), ***selecting a desired document*** (i.e., as the image data or document) ***from the list of the documents*** (i.e., as the first image data or the first document) ***stored in the server E103*** (i.e., as the asserted other image forming apparatus), ***and transmitting a second transmission request for sending the desired document*** (i.e., as the image data or document) ***to the server E103*** (i.e., as the asserted other image forming apparatus).

Therefore, Iwata does not disclose or suggest “a list reception unit configured to transmit a first transmission request for a list of the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus and to receive the list of the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus, an operation unit configured to select a desired image data or document from the list of the first image data or the first document stored in the other image forming apparatus, a request transmission unit configured to transmit a second transmission request for sending the desired image data or document to the other image forming apparatus,” as recited in Claim 76.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that Iwata fails to disclose or suggest or make obvious the pending claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection based on Iwata is respectfully requested for at least these reasons.


Delaney and Butterworth have been considered but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Iwata with regard to Claim 76. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 76 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Iwata, Delaney, and Butterworth, either alone or in proper combination.

Additionally, although differing at least in scope, independent Claims 80 and 81 patentably distinguish over Iwata, Delaney, and Butterworth for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 76. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 80 and 81 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over Iwata, Delaney, and Butterworth, either alone or in proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Christopher R. O'Brien
Registration No. 63,208